



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/177,700 10/23/98 GARDELL

S 97-813

LM02/0120

LEONARD C SUCHYTA  
GTE SERVICE CORPORATION  
MAILCODE: HQE03G13  
600 HIDDEN RIDGE  
IRVING TX 75038

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2738

DATE MAILED:

01/20/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/177,700

Applicant(s)  
Gardell et al.

Examiner  
Hanh Nguyen

Group Art Unit  
2738



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Serial numbers should be filled out in the blank on lines 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 of page 1. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kumar et al.** (US Pat. No. 6,006,253) in view of **Pepper et al.** (US Pat. No. 5,930,700).

- Regarding claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8 Kumar et al. discloses, in Fig.1, a Gateway 122 that communicates between PSTN 170 and computer H.323 terminals. The gateway 122 provides appropriate conversions between different network types (a Gateway in communication with a switch circuit network and translates PSTN signals into computer network signals). See col.3, lines 5-37. A Multipoint Control Unit 126 (MCU) in which a Manager Control (MC) is included

Art Unit:

is connected with the gateway 122 and H.324 terminals. The MCU 126 may be located in the gateway 122, Gatekeeper 124 or stands alone to receive signals from H.324 terminals and forward them to a respective terminal such as H.323 terminal. The MCU 126 also performs video switching or mixing and transmits the resulting media streams back to the terminal (a signal routing agent communicates with gateway, receives incoming calls from the gateway ). See col.3, lines 30-50 and col.4, lines 30-45. **Kumar et al.** does not disclose the signal routing agent is programmed to simultaneously transmit plural line appearance signals to the selected terminal. **Pepper et al.** disclose, in Fig.3, a service control module 306 that is in communication with subscriber 's PDA 200. The PDA 200 connects with programmed software which is stored in database 208 to automatically transmit appearance signals to the screen of the PDA 200 via a graphical user interface (GUI). The GUI is represented as a screen in Fig.7 (transmits appearance signals to the selected terminal). See col.5, lines 20-45. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to use the programmed software and GUI of **Pepper et al.** into the network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to transmit to subscribers' terminals new appearance messages from callers.

- Regarding claim 3, **Kumar et al.** discloses ,in Fig.2B, H.323 terminals within panel 210 communicate with the MCU 220 in a point-to-point manner on the H.245 control channel 222 and audio, video channel 228 (signal routing agent is in communication with respective terminals). See col.4, lines 30-45.

Art Unit:

- Regarding claim 4, **Kumar et al.** discloses substantially the limitations of this claim in claim 1 above, except that **Kumar et al.** does not disclose a configuration database storing terminal information. **Pepper et al.** discloses, in Fig.3, a database 308 that contains a copy of subscriber's phone book. See col.5, lines 33-40. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to use the database 308 of **Pepper et al.**'s system into the network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to store information such as phone numbers.

- Regarding claim 5, **Kumar et al.** does not disclose the database comprises an association table. **Pepper et al.** discloses, in Fig.8, a phone book screen 800 which provides a database for maintaining a list of names 806, phone numbers 808, and addresses 810. All of these are arranged in a table. See col.9, lines 10-20. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the table database of **Pepper et al.**'s into the network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to determine the terminal corresponding to the dialed number.

- Regarding claim 9, this claim is directed to the same subject matter claim 1, except for the following: **Kumar et al.** discloses, in Fig.1, a Gatekeeper 124 that provides control access over network 110 in such a way the gatekeeper 124 is connected with the gateway 122 and MCU 126 (at least one gate keeper in communication with the gateway, and controls the gateway to transmit signals to the signal routing agent ). See col.3, lines 40-50.

- Regarding claim 10, this claim is directed to the same subject matter claim 1.  
Therefore, it is subject to the same rejection.

Art Unit:

- Regarding claims 12 and 14, these claims are directed to the same subject matter claim

7. Therefore, they are subject to the same rejection.

- Regarding claim 13, this claim is directed to the same subject matter claim 6.

Therefore, it is subject to the same rejection.

- Regarding claim 15, this claim is directed to the same subject matter claim 1. Therefore, it is subject to the same rejection.

- Regarding claim 16, **Kumar et al.** does not disclose the step of displaying which comprises scrollable list of the plural line appearances. **Pepper et al.** discloses, in Fig.7, a main menu screen 700. The screen 700 provides a window 706 which lists recently received messages and indicates the origin of the call, the type of the call . See col.8, lines 60-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to use the menu screen 700 of **Pepper et al.** as a scrollable list of line appearances in **Kumar et al.** so that the called party can decide whether to response the incoming calls or not.

- Regarding claims 17 and 18, these claims are directed to the same subject matter claim 1, except for the following: **Kumar et al.** does not disclose a database that determines terminals corresponding to the dialed number. **Pepper et al.** discloses, in Fig.3, a database 308 that communicates with the PDA 200. The database 308 may contain a copy of the subscriber 's Phone book and Date book databases. Preferably, the database 308 automatically synchronizes with the information stored in the subscriber 's PDA 200 ( a database that determines terminals corresponding to the dialed number). See col.5, lines 30-45. Therefore, it would have been

Art Unit:

obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to use the database 308 of **Pepper et al.** 's system into the network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to determine terminals corresponding to dialed number.

- Regarding claim 19, this claim is directed to the same subject matter claims 1 and 17. Therefore, it is subject to the same rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 11 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kumar et al.** (US Pat. No. 6,006,253).

- Regarding claim 11, **Kumar et al.** does not disclose a second Gatekeeper that connects to the first Gatekeeper. However, it is well known in the art to add a second Gatekeeper that connects to the first Gatekeeper, signal routing agent. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to add a second Gatekeeper into network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to locate a gatekeeper that services a particular dialed number.

### ***Conclusion***

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Elliott et al. (US Pat. No. 5,987,102) discloses a Method and Apparatus for bridging a Voice Call Including Selective provision of Information in Non-Audio To the caller.

Art Unit:

- Gallagher et al. (US Pat. No. 5,933,784) discloses a Signaling Gateway System and Method.

- O' Neil et al. (US Pat. No. 5,963,547) discloses a Method and Apparatus for Centralized Multipoint Conferencing in a Packet Network.

- Guy et al. (US Pat. No. 5,940,479) discloses a System and Method for Transmitting Aural Information Between a Computer and Telephone Equipment.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-5445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached on (703) 305-4744. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to :**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington D.C. 20231

**or faxed to :** (703) 308-6743 or (703) 305-3988

**For informal or draft communications,** please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"



Application/Control Number: 09/177,700

Page 8

Art Unit:


Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Dr.

Arlington VA, Sixth floor (Receptionist)

Hanh Nguyen



January 10, 2000



HASSAN KIZOU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700